PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	City of Fontana	**Amount Requested**	$9,950,000
Proposal Title	Vulcan Pit Flood Control and Aquifer Recharge Project	**Total Proposal Cost**	$19,900,000

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Improve flood control and enhance water conservation. The project consists of a flood control and aquifer recharge basin and related conveyance facilities. The project is a stand-alone project that will capture storm water, convey both storm and recycled water to a flood control and aquifer recharge basin. The project will recharge 2800 AC-FT of storm water and an identical amount of recycled water for total recharge of 5600 AC-FT during an average rainfall year. The Project will construct a 1,740 acre-foot detention and recharge basin in a 66.7 acre former mining pit, and will improve nearly a mile of an existing stormwater channel. It will also construct over 3 miles of recycled water pipeline to deliver recycled water to the basin for groundwater recharge.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	**9/15**	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	**12/12**
Budget	**3/5**	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	**6/12**
Schedule	**3/5**	Program Preferences	**6/10**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**1/5**		
		Total Score (max. possible = 64)	**40**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The Work Plan criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The Proposal includes goals and objectives, and states that the project is consistent with the adopted IRWM Plan, but does not discuss how it is consistent with the Plan. A tabulated overview of the project components is included; however, it conflicts with the BMS application abstract. The Work Plan states the basin capacity is 1740 acre feet, where as the BMS proposal states that the Project will recharge 2800 acre feet of storm water and an identical amount of recycled water for total recharge of 5600 AF during an average rainfall year. The Proposal includes a map (Attachment 3.2) showing the relative project

location, although the FEMA (Attachment 3.1) maps do not show the relation to the proposed Project site. Scientific or technical information that supports the feasibility of the Project is not discussed. Plans and specifications are not submitted with the Proposal.

Budget

The Budget has detailed cost information, but the supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the categories. Summary and detailed Budgets are provided in Attachment 4, although the grant amount requested and total project cost does not agree with the information submitted in the BMS application ($7.469M vs. $9.95M and $19.5M vs. $19.9M, respectively). The Budget does not provide enough details to show how the costs are estimated, with the exception of the land purchase value calculations. For example, wages and hours are not given for the direct project administration or construction administration items, and the Proposal does not explain how the percentages of total construction costs used to estimate the costs in all other categories are determined. The unit costs for the construction cost estimate are based on average bid amounts received in the local area in the past year. It appears that the calculation for the 38% funding match claimed is only considering other state funds being used, which are not eligible. The non-state funding match share is 23% of the total project cost.

Schedule

The Schedule is consistent, but does not seem entirely reasonable. The tasks generally correspond to the tasks described in the Work Plan. For example: the Schedule contains all eleven tasks in the Work Plan plus three construction subtasks. The Environmental Documentation task is given four months to complete, beginning May 27, 2011. This may be unrealistic if the initial study has not been completed yet, and it is determined that an environmental impact report (EIR) is required. Any delay in completing the environmental documentation may delay the start of the construction beyond six months from the anticipated award date. Construction is scheduled to commence February 17, 2012.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures criterion is minimally addressed and not well documented. The Project Performance Measures Table described in the PSP is not included. There are no output or outcome indicators presented. A simple yet incorrectly structured project performance measures table is given. The project performance table simply measures stormwater and recycled water flows for a year. It does not present goals, outcomes, indicators or targets except for target goal of water to be recharged. There is not enough detail presented to determine if the project targets are feasible. The Proposal does not discuss if the Project is consistent with the Region's Basin Plan.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

High levels of Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal, based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation. The analysis is well supported and documented. A key benefit value reported in Table 12 does not match number in the FRAM analysis. After the adjustment, the Present Value of FDR benefits are greater. The value of water supply benefits is potentially overestimated, but even with this possibility, the benefits to FDR and water supply remain high relative to project cost.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Average levels of Water Quality and Other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated.

Water quality benefits are described as blending benefits to reduce concentrations in existing groundwater, but “per acre-feet” avoided treatment cost is not explained.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Include regional projects or programs, Effectively Integrate Water Management Programs and Projects, Effectively Resolve Significant Water-related Conflicts within or between Regions, and Drought Preparedness. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.